DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 505 CS 003 060

AUTHOR Palmatier, Robert A., Ed.
TITLE [Graduate Reading Teacher Education.]
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 34p.; The Epistle is the Publication Forum of Professors of Reading Teacher Educators, which is a special-interest group of the International Reading Association
JOURNAL CIT Epistle; v3 n4 Entire Issue Oct 1976

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Content; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Reading; *Reading Instruction; Scholarly Journals; Student Seminars; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

In this issue of "Epistle," contributors focus on different areas of professional concern related to graduate programs in reading teacher education. The first article reports the results of a survey of 85 journal editors regarding articles acceptable for publication and considers the implications of journal practices upon authors. In the second article, three graduate students describe their efforts to establish a student-managed graduate seminar, while in the third article the authors discuss a research-oriented approach to determining what should be taught in reading education courses. The author of the fourth article contends that teacher education is responsible for the current situation found in public school reading education. Regular features of "Epistle" include a list of job vacancies, brief notices concerning items related to reading education, and information about contributing authors. (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132505

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

VOLUME III

NUMBER 4

1976

Elementary English

CS 003 060

Vol. 3, No. 4

EDITORIAL STAFF

Robert A. Palmatier
EDITOR

Kemble Oliver
ASSISTANT EDITOR

Debbie Holman
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

EDITORIAL ADVISORS

Richard Allington
State University of
New York at Albany

Ernest Dishner
Arizona State University

Anthony Manzo
University of Missouri
at Kansas City

David Pearson
University of Minnesota

Charles Peters
Oakland Schools

Frederick Raetsch
Clemson University

EPISTLE is the publication forum of the Professors of Reading Teacher Educators Special Interest Group of the International Reading Association.

CORRESPONDENCE:

Membership Application

Warren Wheelock
College of Education
University of Missouri
Kansas City, Mo. 64110

Editorial Concerns

Robert A. Palmatier
309 Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, Ga. 30602

Membership in PRTE is six dollars ($6.00) per year and includes quarterly issues of EPISTLE. Additional copies of EPISTLE are available for $1.50 to members and $2.00 to non-members.

EPISTLE is printed by the University of Georgia Central Duplicating Service, Athens, Georgia.

EPISTLE

Athens, Georgia
October 1976

Dear Colleagues:

This issue concludes volume three of EPISTLE. In addition, this is the final issue included in the current membership year. Thus, it is time to ask each reader to forward an application form and payment to Warren Wheelock, secretary of the Professor of Reading Teacher Educators Special Interest Group, to establish membership for the 1977 calendar year. Your six dollors ($6.00) will provide support for the group's efforts in serving the interests of persons involved in graduate training in reading education. In addition to quarterly issues of EPISTLE, members are invited to attend the groups annual business meeting and program at the International Reading Association Convention. The success of this effort depends on your support.

This issue contains the sort of article mix for which EPISTLE strives. Each of the four articles deal with reading, but each deals with a different area of professional concern related to graduate programs.

Publications and what is required to achieve an appropriate list of journal articles frequently enter into "shop talk" discussions between reading educators. Hal Seaton, Robert Aaron, and Virginia Mickish report on a survey of editors whose journals publish articles concerning reading. The results offer some ideas as to what authors are up against and also some information concerning the typical failings of rejected articles.

Three graduate students report, in the second article, on their efforts to establish a student managed graduate seminar. Lyndell Grey, Mark Condon, and Marilyn Eanet offer both a rationale for a student organized seminar and advice based on their experiences in participating in such an effort. Procedures, objectives, and worthwhile topics are considered.

Instruction is the major occupation of most reading educators. In the third article, Jerome Harste and Darryl Strickler discuss a research oriented approach to determining what should be taught in reading education courses. Their approach considers determining faculty agreement of topics and competencies to be included. In addition, the writers offer a model for validating the faculty determined training content through assessment of teacher opinion.

In discussing what she feels are the critical issues in reading today, Jean Greenlaw utilizes the opportunity EPISTLE offers to all individuals concerned with graduate training in reading. This fourth article focuses on Dr. Greenlaw's concerns about how teacher training content and methodology relate to the sort of instructional problems recently highlighted in the popular media.

Orinarily with the job hunting season over, JOB REPORT takes a one issue leave of absence. However, this year some positions were not filled from initial advertizing and are currently reopened with late 1976 employment dates.

MOVERS returns in this issue to record new positions secured by this year's doctoral graduates and the relocations of veteran reading folk. Your assistance is needed to insure that the necessary information on movers to and from your institution is included in the next issue. Please help us to provide a comprehensive picture by making use of the form printed on the pink centerfold.

TIME CAPSULE and ABOUT THE AUTHORS wraps up this issue. Hopefully you will find these contents sufficient to motivate you to use the centerfold form to continue or begin membership in the Professors of Reading Teacher Educators Special Interest Group. Rejoin or join us and lend your support.

Sincerely,

Bob

Robert A. Palmatier
Chairman, PRTE

Vol. 3, No. 4 October 1976

EPISTLE

The Publication Forum of
Professors of Reading Teacher Educators
A Special Interest Group of the
International Reading Association

Contents

An Investigation of Journal Publishing Policies in the Area of Reading
Hal W. Seaton, Robert L. Aaron, and Virginia L. Mickish

A Student Proposed Alternate to Doctoral Seminar
Lyndell Finch Grey, Mark W. F. Condon, and Marilyn G. Eanet

Toward Validating Reading Teacher Competencies
Jerome Harste and Darryl Strickler

What We Have Sown, That Shall We Reap
M. Jean Greenlaw

Regular Features

MOVERS

JOB REPORT

FOR THE TIME CAPSULE

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

An Investigation of Journal Publishing Policies in the Area of Reading

Hal W. Seaton
Robert L. Aaron
University of Georgia

and

Virginia L. Mickish
DeKalb County (Georgia) Schools

Those concerned with the broad spectrum of reading interests write for a multitude of reasons. "Publish or perish," is often heard as a lament, a rationalization, or occasionally a belligerent command. Each writer soon learns that being able to write a good manuscript is only the beginning. The acceptance of an article is contingent not only on quality, but also on format, length, and appropriateness of subject matter for the particular journal to which it is submitted. Even after acceptance for publication, an author still may wait two years or more to see his article in print.

The purpose of this report is twofold: 1) to delineate the positions of 85 editors who responded to a questionnaire designed to investigate policies of journals identified by Otto (1974) as typically publishing articles pertaining to reading, and 2) to consider the implications of these trends upon efforts to disseminate scholarly efforts.

Research Methodology

In 1975, a questionnaire was mailed to the editors of 106 journals. Of the total 91 questionnaires returned, 85 contained sufficient responses to be included in a tabulation of the data. Sixty-seven variables were statistically analyzed to determine current publishing policies as well as anticipated future trends. A subset of the 23 journals most frequently cited as sources of reading articles was statistically compared with the remainder to determine if significant differences existed between the two journal groups. Mean differences were subjected to a "t" test with .05 as the level of significance.

Results and Conclusions

The findings of this study indicated that the 85 journals reporting published 6,176 articles during the calendar year 1974. Of this number,

1,421 articles, or 23 percent, were directly concerned with reading. As expected, the sub-set of 23 most frequently cited journals was significantly different from the total group and accounted for 71 percent of the total number or 1,009 reading articles.

Frequency of acceptance or rejection, lag times to publication, as well as reasons for rejection were major concerns of this study. The mean acceptance rate for the 85 journals was 31 percent of all manuscripts submitted, but only 16 percent were accepted without requiring major revision. The mean acceptance rate for the sub-set of most frequently cited journals was slightly lower at 28 percent with 13 percent being accepted without major revision. No significant differences occurred between means on this variable.

Interesting findings emerged when the editors were questioned about responsibility for acceptance or rejection of manuscripts. Of the total sample, 35 percent reported that one or more impartial referees were consulted, 12 percent indicated that the editor was the sole judge, and 53 percent did not respond to the item. The percentages were significantly higher for the sub-set of journals with 44 percent citing the use of referees, 22 percent indicating no referees and 34 percent failing to respond to the question.

Table 1 shows the responses of all reporting journals concerning lag times from receipt of manuscripts to the decision to accept or reject as well as lag times from acceptance to publication. For all of the reporting journals, the mean lag time from receipt to accept/reject was slightly more than nine weeks. Mean lag time from acceptance to publication was 32 weeks. For the sub-set of journals, mean lag time from receipt to accept/reject was nearly 12 weeks with a mean elapsed time of 29 weeks from acceptance to publication. While the sub-set group reported a higher average and was significantly different from the total group on lag time from receipt to decision to accept or reject, no significant difference was found between the two groups on lag time from acceptance to publication.

Also of interest was a comparison of the total sample and the sub-group on manuscript handling procedures. Of the eight procedures considered by the editors, four were significantly different between groups. The data contained in Table 2 shows the sub-group to more frequently use "blind" referreeing and to return rejected manuscripts while the total group is more likely to exclusively report research and make the author known to referees.

TABLE 1

Average Time (weeks) from Receipt to Accept
or Reject and Acceptance to Publication

Time (weeks)	Total Sample		Sub-Set	
	Lag Time Accept/Reject (Percentage)	Lag Time Accept to Publish (Percentage)	Lag Time Accept/Reject (Percentage)	Lag Time Accept to Publish (Percentage)
1-2	9.5	0.0	13.0	0.0
3-5	18.8	0.0	8.7	0.0
6-10	35.3	14.2	26.1	8.6
11-20	24.6	19.0	43.3	25.9
21-36	3.5	30.3	4.3	39.0
37-52	1.2	15.3	4.3	17.3
Over 52	0.0	13.0	0.0	8.6
No Response	7.1	8.2	0.0	0.0

TABLE 2

Manuscript Handling Procedures

Procedure	Total Journals (Percent)	Sub-Set (Percent)
Receipt of m.s. acknow.	89.4	95.6
Author nominates referees	5.9	0.0
"Blind" refereeing	44.7	87.0
Author known to referees	72.9	52.2
Critique sent to author	49.4	60.1
Rejected m.s. returned	72.9	91.3
Research reports only	92.9	65.2
Refer to another journal	4.7	13.0

The preferred, maximum, and minimum length of manuscripts in terms of words and pages was investigated. The greatest number of editors reporting a preference (approximately 30 percent) suggested 1500 to 4000 words or four to nine journal pages as being ideal. However, over 60 percent of the editors reported no maximum number of words or pages and an even greater percentage (approximately 70 percent) indicated no minimum number in either category.

The data shown in Table 3 indicates that the major reason for rejection of manuscripts by the editors of both the total group and sub-set was failure to add to the current body of knowledge. Other major reasons for rejection in the order of importance to editors, were poorly written articles, inadequate research design, inappropriate subject matter, and too superficial in terms of content. When the 10 means of this variable were analyzed for differences between the total group and the sub-set of journals only two variables yielded significant differences. The sub-set of journals received more manuscripts with inappropriate subject matter while the total sample indicated "other" reasons to a greater degree than did the sub-set.

When editors comments regarding "other" reasons for rejection were analyzed, some interesting facts emerged. Failure on the part of the author to research journal policy prior to submission of a manuscript was listed by numerous editors as a major reason for rejection. In particular, editors noted that authors often submitted incorrect numbers of copies, especially to referreed journals. Table 4 shows that over 80 percent of the total sample specifies submission of either two or three copies while over 90 percent of the sub-set requires multiple copies.

TABLE 3

Major Reasons for Rejection of Manuscripts by Journal Editors (Shown in Mean Percentage)

REASONS	MEAN PERCENTAGE	
	Total Sample N=85	Sub-Set N=23
1. Too esoteric	2	1
2. Too superficial	12	13
3. Too speculative	1	2
4. Inappropriate subject matter	12	16
5. Author's weak or inappropriate credentials for the subject matter	1	1
6. Poorly written	18	19
7. Inadequate research design	16	18
8. Inadequate statistics	9	8
9. Does not add to the current body of knowledge	22	21
10. Other (explain)	7	1

TABLE 4

Preferred Number of Copies to be Submitted to
Total Sample and Sub-Group

No. Copies	Total Samples		Sub-Set	
	Number	%	Number	%
1	5	5.9	0	0.0
2	36	42.4	4	17.4
3	35	41.2	17	73.9
Over 3	5	5.8	2	8.7
No Response	4	4.7	0	0.0
	85	100.0	23	100.0

In addition, editors frequently mentioned that authors are not sensitive to the needs of the journal audience. In Table 5 data are presented to show that in both the total sample and the sub-set, the vast majority of intended readers are researchers, advanced graduate students, or teachers. However, according to the respondents, over 50 percent of the manuscripts submitted were intended for audiences other than those stated in the journal policy.

TABLE 5

Intended Journal Audience for Total Sample and Sub-Set

Audience	Total Sample (Percent	Sub-Set (Percent)
General Public	9.4	4.3
Undergrad Students	20.0	8.7
College Educ. Public	17.6	4.3
Beginning Grad Students	29.4	26.1
Advanced Grad Students	76.5	82.6
Teachers	76.5	73.9
Researchers	82.4	91.3
Administrators	38.8	21.7
Practitioners	56.5	43.5
People in Related Fields	55.3	69.5
Others	5.9	4.3

Discussion

The major findings of this investigation indicate that of the journals sampled, over 6,000 manuscripts pertaining to reading were submitted for consideration during the calendar year 1974. Of this number, slightly more than 1,400 were published with approximately 1,200 requiring major revision by the author. Further, the findings show that an author can expect a lapse of approximately ten weeks from submission to a decision to accept or reject his manuscript. An additional 30 weeks is then required before publication.

The data further indicated that only one of three journals is impartially refereed and in over 70 percent of the instances, the author is known to the referees. When a preference for manuscript of length was indicated, editors suggested 1500 to 4000 words or four to nine pages.

Failure to add to the current body of knowledge, poorly written articles, and inadequate research design were most frequently cited by the editors as reasons for rejection. In addition, editors noted that failure on the part of the author to familiarize himself with journal policy and intended audience were major reasons for rejection.

While the data presented here are only a sampling of the 67 variables studied, they do point out the magnitude of the effort to disseminate scholarly works. Editors reported that while the quantity of reading related manuscripts has increased drastically during the past several years, the quality has increased also. These factors have been responsible for increased lag times but also for a better quality journal product. Several editors noted that in order to cope with the flood of good manuscripts, they have increased the number of editions per year, increased the size of individual editions, reduced the size of articles, or used a combination of these factors.

As acceptance rates are continually reduced, more and more high-quality manuscripts will be published by presently less-renowned journals. This will likely increase the prestige and status of these journals, thus making them more attractive for both authors and readers.

An additional force working to reduce the pressure on the journal system and to help cut the average lag time to publication is the introduction of a significant number of new reading related journals. For example (Brown, 1974) noted that no less than 19 such journals have appeared in print since 1970. Undoubtedly, the emergence of these journals is in response to market pressure.

In conclusion, the following measures are called for if the effectiveness and relevance of the reading journal system is to be maintained: 1) an explicit recognition and open discussion of the problems and promise of the present journal system; 2) regular monitoring of the system in terms of the number of new submissions, review times, acceptance rates, and lag times to publication; 3) more coordination and cooperation among journal editors; 4) a closer analysis of the criteria being established by emerging journals, and 5) more effort to clearly communicate procedures and writing guidelines to potential authors.

References

Brown, Norman B. "Prince Indexes for 1974," Library Journal, 99: 1775-1799, July 1, 1974.

Otto, Wayne. "Introduction to the Issue," Journal of Educational Research, 67: 387-391, May-June, 1974.

A Student Proposed Alternate to Doctoral Seminar

Lyndell Finch Grey
University of Georgia

Mark W. F. Condon
University of Louisville

Marilyn G. Eanet
Rhode Island College

A doctoral program is a complex and taxing affair for all involved. A frequent source of tension is the complaints of students over limited opportunities for leadership, while another is the faculty lament of too little time and too much responsibility. An often overlooked means for reducing some of this tension can come from within the framework of the doctoral seminar.

Traditionally, the doctoral seminar is professor-directed and although students may be allowed to choose topics for research and reports, the focus and organization of the seminar remain the professor's prerogative. In contrast, the University of Missouri-Kansas City has experimented with a student-planned and student-directed doctoral seminar.

In 1974 the doctoral program in reading at the University was still in its early stages of development; there was no doctoral seminar. There was, however, a sufficient number of doctoral students who felt the need to share in and learn from the study and research of other graduate students. This need and the encouragement of some of the reading education faculty brought students together for the first meeting of what came to be called the Forum.

A triumverate of three students formed a steering committee and organized the first meeting. This steering committee system continues to provide leadership for the group, with two members rotating off the committee each semester. Individuals recommended by the steering committee and approved by the seminar at large are selected to fill the committee vacancies. This system allow any willing doctoral student the opportunity to participate in organizing and leading the group at some point in his or her program.

A major goal of the Forum is placing responsibility for membership, education, and participation on the individual student. Three seminar objectives were set to facilitate this goal:

> Students will learn how to....
> (1) identify issues deserving presentation and/or discussion;

(2) recognize their own needs and deficiencies; and
(3) take the responsibility for enhancement of their own education.

The first objective has been attained many times. A rather prominent example was inviting a faculty member from the School of Education to speak to the Forum on psycholinguistics. At that time no member of the reading faculty had specific training nor first hand knowledge of this aspect of reading and no courses were offered with such an emphasis. The graduate students identified this overlooked aspect of their education and one student discovered a member of the larger education faculty who had done extensive studying and work for a well known psycholinguist. This seminar session on psycholinguistics was one of the more informative and lively meetings of the semester resulting in a broader educational scope for all participants.

An example of meeting the second objective is found in the decision one semester to have all participants take responsibility for two or three education Journals, abstract articles germane to reading, and share copies of these abstracts with fellow students. The Forum participants recognized their inability to keep up with information in the numerous educational Journals (other than reading) while engaged in heavy course loads with numerous assistantship responsibilities, but felt they needed to be current in their knowledge of research that related to reading. Within the framework of the seminar they were able to use joint effort and meet this need.

Finally, it must be acknowledged that some University professors question the feasibility of the third objective, which calls upon students to take responsibility for their own education. This is a legitimate concern. There are occasions in the Forum when time is wasted on insignificant or irrelevant issues; however, the most conscientiously conducted professor-directed seminar is open to the same criticism. In either situation, it must be acknowledged that whatever a student gains from the seminar is in direct proportion to what he or she puts into it. The student-directed format allows participants to:

(1) Learn from mistakes
(2) Seek assistance when necessary
(3) Benefit from personal decisions and topic selections

The Forum provides the usual benefits of a doctoral seminar, but also provides for some additional benefits which are closely correlated with actual student needs. Although doctoral programs are traditionally designed to develop academic and research competencies, the professional demands that a graduate will face require developed leadership and

organizational capabilities as well. It must also be recognized that the doctorate is not a terminal point in an individual's academic career, but (hopefully) the beginning of self-directed and continuing educational development. The activities and responsibilities required by the student-directed seminar help to develop such capabilities.

The student-directed seminar at UM-KC is the principal doctoral seminar; however, other colleges and universities might incorporate this concept even when there is an existing doctoral seminar. The student-directed seminar can be one of several seminars in a large doctoral program while another alternative would be to use the student-directed during one quarter or semester and the traditional, professor-directed format during the remainder of the year. Other alternatives are possible as well.

The investment made in the doctoral candidate is enormous by the student, by his professors, and by society itself. Exploring alternate possibilities for enriching the students' experiences, without increasing the time expenditures of those students' professors, would appear to offer some substantial benefits.

Association members will receive further information early in '77. Nonmembers may receive information by writing IRA at 800 Barksdale Road, Newark, Delaware 19711, U.S.A.

Reading to Be Free

Twenty-second Annual Convention
International Reading Association
May 2-6, 1977

TOWARD VALIDATING READING TEACHER COMPETENCIES

Jerome Harste
Darryl Strickler
Indiana University

Research studies attempting to identify key variables in reading instruction have repeatedly reached the conclusion that it is the teacher, not the instructional approach, material or grouping pattern used, which most clearly accounts for the variance in reading progress among children (Artley, 1969; Austin and Morrison, 1963; Bond and Dykstra, 1967; Harris, 1969, etc.). Despite the apparently significant relationship between the "teacher variable" and good reading instruction, few research studies explore which specific teacher behaviors or competencies contribute most to optimum pupil performance in reading.

Lacking such basic information about teacher competencies and related pupil behaviors, it seems premature that competency-based programs designed to prepare teachers of reading are being developed. Clearly anyone who has engaged in such an adventure must agree with Turner (1973) that competency-based programs are typically composed of sets of competencies which represent the "best guesses" of experts. Without basic research designed to validate competencies, educators have little else to build upon.

To provide the kind of research base needed to validate competencies in the area of teaching reading, it is proposed that a series of interrelated explorations be undertaken. The blueprint for this series of studies builds upon the ideas of Artley (1969) and specifies a research strategy by which the profession might empirically validate competencies in the teaching of reading.

Step One: Developing a procedure whereby the profession might identify the components of what is meant by reading maturity at various levels, i.e., primary grade level, intermediate grade level, etc.

Step Two: Identify means by which behaviors such as those defined in step one will be measured.

Step Three: Identify teachers who are successful and less successful in helping children grow in reading maturity as defined and measured in Steps One and Two.

Step Four: Ascertain teacher behaviors which appear to distinguish successful from less successful teachers of reading.

Step Five: Through experimentation, determine the relationship between each behavior and pupil growth toward reading maturity.

Step Six: Use the information provided in Steps One through Five to improve the program of teacher education in reading by developing teacher training materials which attempt to prepare students in these competencies.

Step Seven: Validate these training materials using as criteria the intersect of teacher performance and pupil learning.

The studies which are reported below represent an attempt to operationalize the first step of this overall strategy for validating reading teacher competencies. Specifically this paper discusses and explores three assumptions which underlie the first step and upon which the viability of the model depends: (1) that agreement among groups of reading educators and reading teachers is possible; (2) that pupil outcomes can be identified which are acceptable to reading educators as definitions of reading maturity; and (3) that once identified, these pupil outcomes can be ordered as to their saliency at primary and intermediate grade levels.

Study One

Ten members of the Reading faculty of a major midwestern university served as the subjects for Study One (N = 10). All subjects held a doctorate in their field of specialization and were engaged in teaching, research, and/or service activities related to the area of reading at the time the study was conducted.

Subjects were asked to rank the importance of twelve "pupil outcomes for reading" which were identified by the Center for the Study of Evaluation (Hoepfner, Bradley, Klein and Alkin, 1972). Following is a list of the twelve pupil outcomes used in the study:

Attitude and Behavior Modification From Reading. Selects different types of reading materials according to purposes. Reads newspapers and other sources of information. Seeks out certain types of materials to get specific information, and as an aid to study. Is able to change behavior, feelings, and opinions as a result of knowledge gained through reading.

Attitude Toward Reading. Reads various types of literature in spare time for personal enjoyment. Reads to improve understanding of mankind. Enjoys the various ways in which literature presents ideas (poetry, fiction, etc.). Understands the help reading offers

for improving vocabulary, speaking, and writing abilities. Likes to read.

Critical Reading. Recognizes intentions of author and purpose of the writing. Can decide on the basis of logic and judgment the quality of the writing. Can tell fact from fiction and one type of literature from another (fairy tales, true stories, etc.). Can recognize writing that encourages one point of view over any other or that does not make logical sense. Can tell the difference between fact, opinion, guesses, and statements of feelings.

Inference Making from Selected Selections. Correctly interprets what is read. Recognizes from the materials what kinds of characters are being talked about. Can tell that the characters in a story are sad or happy, trustworthy or untrustworthy, etc. Can tell why characters act as they do.

Oral Reading. Reads aloud with correct feeling and meaning. Reads clearly and smoothly. Uses expression in reading aloud. Reads words correctly. Understands what is being read.

Phonetic Recognition. Can identify the sounds of letters (phonetics). Can sound-out words when sounds correspond to spelling. Uses the sounding-out of letters and words (phonics) as a reading tool.

Recognition of Literary Devices. Recognizes basic figures of speech such as metaphors (seeing one thing in terms of another: "The hummingbird is a flying jewel"); symbols (things that stand for something else, as the dove stands for peace); irony (results opposite to intentions: In getting his wish for gold, King Midas also turned his daughter into gold); exaggeration (making a thing seem more or less significant than it is: "I was so scared, I jumped a mile!").

Recognition of Word Meanings. Has a good vocabulary. Recognizes the meanings of words by the way they are used. Recognizes words by looking at common beginnings and endings. Recognizes words that mean the same thing, opposite things, and words that sound alike but mean different things. Uses logic in trying to understand the meaning of words.

Remembering Information Read. Recalls main ideas and the details and events in the order in which they appeared in the reading.

Silent Reading Efficiency. Selects reading speed to meet need (understanding as a whole, to remember all or part, or to remember specific facts in the material).

Structural Recognition. Recognizes word roots, common beginnings and endings (pre- and -ing), syllables, plurals, and word combinations (contractions such as isn't, haven't, aren't).

Understanding Ideational Complexes. (Reading Comprehension). Understands both the main ideas and the details that support the ideas of reading selections. Can state the ideas in different words. Understands the message presented in the reading.

Subjects were provided with a set of twelve index cards, each containing one of the pupil outcomes listed above, and were asked to assign four pupil outcomes to each category of importance, i.e. "most importance", "average importance", and "least importance". The following written directions accompanied the twelve cards:

> ". . . . the twelve cards contain proposed statements of what a child ought to be able to do as a result of the elementary reading instruction s/he received. We would like to know which of these outcomes you feel are of most importance, which are of average importance, and which are of least importance."

The ratings were completed independently by each subject on an individual basis; there was no discussion among subjects regarding the perceived importance of the pupil outcomes.

First Study Results

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W) was computed to determine the degree of agreement among subjects in their rating of the twelve pupil outcomes for reading. The results of this computation are presented in Table I below.

The magnitude of Concordance (W = .45) indicated a high level of agreement among subjects in their rating of the twelve pupil outcomes. The Coefficient of Concordance was tested and found to be significant beyond the .01 level of probability.

Table II below indicates the rank order and weighted mean averages, by relative distribution, of the subjects' rating of the twelve pupil outcomes. Weighted mean averages of 3.0 indicate that either all subjects tended to rate an outcome as having "average importance", or that three nearly equalsized subgroups of subjects varied considerably in their rating of the outcome. Pupil outcomes with weighted means about 3.5 indicate consistent agreement among subjects that the pupil outcome was of "most importance."

Analysis of the data presented in Tables I and II indicate that subjects expressed a nearly unanimous belief that pupil growth and development in the areas of attitude toward reading and reading comprehension are the most important outcomes for reading instruction in elementary schools.

TABLE I

Calculation of the Coefficient of Concordance, the Data Consisting of the Ranking of Twelve Pupil Outcomes in Reading by Ten Professors of Reading

(1) PUPIL OUTCOMES IN READING	(2) PROFESSOR'S RANKS										(3) SUM OF RANKS	(4) D	(5) D^2
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			
Attitude and Behavior Modification from Reading	2.5	6.5	10.5	2.5	6.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	41	24	576
Attitude Toward Reading	2.5	10.5	6.5	2.5	2.5	6.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	41	24	576
Critical Reading	2.5	2.5	6.5	2.5	6.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	33	32	1024
Inference Making From Reading Selections	6.5	6.5	2.5	6.5	2.5	2.5	6.5	2.5	2.5	6.5	45	20	400
Oral Reading	10.5	10.5	6.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	101	36	1296
Phonetic Recognition	10.5	2.5	2.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	77	12	144
Recognition of Literary Devices	10.5	6.5	10.5	6.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	85	20	400
Recognition of Word Meanings	6.5	2.5	2.5	10.5	2.5	6.5	6.5	10.5	6.5	10.5	65	0	0
Remembering Information Read	6.5	6.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	10.5	10.5	85	20	400
Silent Reading Efficiency	6.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	2.5	81	16	256
Structural Recognition	10.5	10.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	6.5	89	24	576
Understanding Ideational Complexes	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	37	28	784
											=780		=6432

$W = .45$ (significant beyond .01 level)

$r_s = .38$

TABLE II

Overall Rank Order and Weighted Mean Averages by Relative Distribution of Pupil Outcomes for Reading Professors (N=10)

SCALE	RANK ORDER	PUPIL OUTCOMES	WEIGHTED MEANS	SCALE
4.6	1	Critical Reading	4.6	4.6
4.4	2	Understanding Ideational Complexes	4.4	4.4
	3.5	Attitude and Behavior Modification from Reading	4.3	
4.2	3.5	Attitude Toward Reading	4.3	4.2
4.0	5	Inference Making From Reading Selections	4.0	4.0
3.8				3.8
3.6				3.6
3.4				3.4
3.2				3.2
3.0	6	Recognition of Word Meanings	3.0	3.0
2.8				2.8
2.6				2.6
2.4	7	Phonetic Recognition	2.4	2.4
2.2	8	Silent Reading Efficiency	2.2	2.2
2.0	9.5	Recognition of Literary Devices	2.0	2.0
	9.5	Remembering Information Read	2.0	
1.8	11	Structural Recognition	1.8	1.8
1.6				1.6
1.4				1.4
1.2	12	Oral Reading	1.2	1.2

In order to formulate a broad and inclusive concept of reading maturity--a first step proposed in validating reading teacher competencies--three assumptions must be tested:

(1) that agreement among groups of reading educators is possible;

(2) that pupil outcomes can be identified which are acceptable to reading educators as definitions of reading maturity; and,

(3) once identified, that pupil outcomes can be ordered as to saliency given various reading maturity points.

The results of Study One lend some credence to the viability and acceptability of these assumptions. That is to say, (1) agreement among faculty members was possible and was found to be significant, (2) the pupil outcomes in reading which were identified by the Center for the Study of Evaluation were generally acceptable as a definition of reading maturity, and (3) salient outcomes, i.e., outcomes which were believed to be those which ought to be broad goals of elementary reading instruction, were identifiable.

Probably one of the most interesting findings in Study One is the agreement among a group of university reading faculty members regarding salient outcomes of good reading instruction at the termination of the elementary schooling process. While the areas identified (attitude and comprehension) might be expected, in that these are areas which are currently prominent in professional thinking, the fact that agreement was found should not be dismissed lightly. Optimistically, if agreement was possible among one group of faculty members, it may be found more generally within the profession. If this is the case, future studies might explore the possibility of identifying a set of outcomes which represent an expert judgment as to what the outcomes of reading instruction ought to be. If such a study were conducted it could potentially provide direction for developers of reading instructional materials and reading tests.

Study Two

Study Two served as an extension of Study One. Specifically, the purpose of Study Two were to determine 1) whether there was agreement between university reading faculty members and public school teachers of reading; and 2) whether there was agreement among public school teachers of reading regarding the relative importance of twelve pupil outcomes in elementary reading instruction.

Two groups of elementary school teachers served as subjects for Study Two (N = 78). Group I (N = 35) consisted of classroom teachers from four elementary schools located in a small Midwestern city and surrounding suburban and rural areas. A second group of teachers (Group 2) consisted of 43 "Reading Laboratory Teachers" from a county school system in Florida. The subjects in Group 2 (N = 43) served as remedial reading

teachers and functioned in a "resource teacher" role, providing services to fellow teachers. The total panel of subjects (Groups 1 and 2) included 52 teachers of primary grade children, and 26 teachers of intermediate grade children.

The procedures used in Study One were also used in Study Two, i.e. subjects were asked to rate the importance of twelve pupil outcomes in reading by assigning four pupil outcomes to each of three categories of perceived importance. Modified directions were provided for teachers of primary grade (K-3) students. They were asked to identify pupil outcomes appropriate for the primary grades.

Study Two Results

Ratings of the pupil outcomes by teachers of primary grade children, and teachers of intermediate grade children were analyzed separately and are reported below by sub-group within the two major groups.

Kendall's Tau-Correlation Between Ranks (T) was computed to determine the extent of agreement that existed among the subgroup rankings of the twelve pupil outcomes. Tau was found to be .70 for the primary grade teacher subgroups and .38 for the intermediate reading teacher subgroups. The significance of tau was tested and found to be significant beyond the .01 level for the primary reading teacher subgroup comparison ($Z = 3.18$) and beyond the .05 level for the intermediate grade teacher subgroup comparison ($Z = 1.72$).

Tables III and IV indicate the rank order and weighted mean averages by relative distribution of pupil outcomes for primary and intermediate teacher participants respectively. Analysis of the data in Tables III and IV suggests that the following pupil outcomes are salient (weighted mean average above 3.5) for primary teachers:

-Phonetic Recognition
-Recognition of Word Meaning
-Attitude Toward Reading
-Structural Recognition
-Understanding Ideational Complexes
-Remembering Information Read

In contrast, the following pupil outcomes are salient for intermediate reading teachers:

-Attitude Toward Reading
-Understanding Ideational Complexes
-Inference Making from Reading Selections

TABLE III

Overall and Subgroup Rank Order and Weighted Mean Averages by Relative Distribution of Pupil Outcomes for Primary Reading Teachers (N=52)

SCALE	RANK ORDER	PUPIL OUTCOMES	SUBGROUP RANK GROUP 1	SUBGROUP RANK GROUP 2	WEIGHTED MEANS	SCALE
4.6						4.6
	1.5	Phonetic Recognition	1.5	1.5	4.5	
4.4	1.5	Recognition of Word Meaning	1.5	1.5	4.5	4.4
4.2						4.2
4.0	3.5	Attitude Toward Reading	4	4	3.9	4.0
	3.5	Structural Recognition	6	3	3.9	
3.8	5	Understanding Ideational	3	6	3.8	3.8
	6	Remembering Information Read	5	5	3.7	
3.6						3.6
3.4						3.4
3.2						3.2
3.0	7.5	Inference Making from Reading	7	9	3.0	3.0
	7.5	Oral Reading	8	7.5	3.0	
2.8	9	Silent Reading Efficiency	9	7.5	2.8	2.8
2.6						2.6
2.4						2.4
2.2						2.2
2.0	10	Critical Reading	10.5	10	2.0	2.0
	11	Attitude and Behavior Modification from Reading	10.5	11	1.9	
1.8						1.8
1.6						1.6
	12	Recognition of Literary Development	12	12	1.5	
1.4						1.4
1.2						1.2

TABLE IV

Overall and Subgroup Rank Order and Weighted Mean Averages by Relative Distribution of Pupil Outcomes for Intermediate Reading Teachers (N=26).

SCALE	RANK ORDER	PUPIL OUTCOMES	SUBGROUP RANK GROUP 1	SUBGROUP RANK GROUP 2	WEIGHTED MEANS	SCALE
4.6						4.6
4.4						4.4
4.2	1	Attitude Towards Reading	1	2	4.2	4.2
4.0						4.0
3.8	2	Understanding Ideational	4.5	1	3.8	3.8
3.6	3	Inference Making from Reading	2	4	3.6	3.6
3.4						3.4
	4	Remembering Information Read	9	3	3.1	
3.2	5.5	Attitude and Behavior Modification from Reading	6.5	5	3.0	3.2
	5.5	Silent Reading Efficiency	4.5	8.5	3.0	
3.0	7.5	Recognition of Word Meaning	3	10	2.9	3.0
	7.5	Critical Reading	6.5	8.5	2.9	
2.8	7.5	Structural Recognition	8	6.5	2.9	2.8
2.6	10	Phonetic Recognition	10.5	6.5	2.6	2.6
2.4						2.4
2.2						2.2
2.0	11	Oral Reading	10.5	11	2.0	2.0
1.8						1.8
	12	Recognition of Literary	12	12	1.7	
1.6						1.6
1.4						1.4
1.2						1.2

Data collected and analyzed from primary and intermediate teachers of reading add further credence to the viability and acceptability of the assumptions underlying the formulation of an operational definition of reading maturity. Specifically, primary and intermediate teachers of reading (1) were found to be in general agreement with their collegial subgroup, (2) were found to be acceptant of pupil outcomes proposed as components of reading maturity, and (3) were able to identify salient outcomes for primary and intermediate grade reading instruction.

Pupil outcomes identified by primary teachers can be grouped into the general areas of skills (including phonetic, structural, linguistic, and contextual word recognition skills), comprehension, and attitudinal development. Intermediate teachers, on the other hand, de-emphasize word recognition skills, and stress instead the area of comprehension and attitude. This finding is interesting in that it mirrors the logical ordering of pupil outcomes as found in most reading materials used in the classroom. This, of course, brings up an interesting speculation as to whether any procedure which rests on teacher beliefs will provide new direction for the profession. The research reported here is not designed to answer this question. Future research might well explore this phenomenon among groups of teachers using materials which differ in underlying philosophy and goals.

Conclusions From Study One and Two

Intermediate teachers of reading in Study Two, as did reading faculty members in Study One, identified the broad areas of attitude and comprehension as major indices of reading maturity for pupils as they complete the elementary school reading program. While this general agreement is noticeable, there exists general disagreement as to what the appropriate level of pupil growth and development in these areas ought to be. Reading faculty members believe and expect higher levels of comprehension and attitudinal development than do the intermediate reading teachers sampled. This discrepancy was explored informally with both groups of participants. Reading faculty members were of the belief that if higher level behaviors in comprehension and attitude were not developed, and made the responsibility of the intermediate reading program, such behaviors would never be developed given the current handling of reading instruction at upper levels. Intermediate reading teachers, on the other hand, felt that the lack of needed reading instruction at the junior and senior high levels should not leave them the scapegoats of faulty professional practices. While consensus on this matter is probably unimportant in terms of the major thrust of research directed toward validating reading teacher competencies, this finding does obviate the need for movement in many directions if the general improvement of reading instruction is to result.

What is far more interesting in terms of conclusions to be drawn from the research reported here is the fact that this set of explorations has identified a viable procedure for operationalizing the formulation of definitions of reading maturity at various levels. Research in the area of reading continues to verify the importance of the teacher in reading instruction (Bond and Dykstra, 1967; Harris and Morrison, 1969; Ransey, 1962). Such research findings place a tremendous professional responsibility on reading teachers. It follows therefore that the professional teacher of reading must also take an active role in defining the criteria to be used and in operationalizing definitions of reading maturity. The research reported here provides educators with a viable set of procedures for initiating such teacher involvement and for continuing the active pursuit of research focused on the validation of reading teacher competencies.

At least two practical applications of the research procedure used in these studies seem obvious. The procedure can and has been used to study and compare reading faculty members' perceptions of reading at the college level. The findings of such research serve to direct program development and can do much to strengthen preservice teacher education programs in reading. Secondly, public school personnel interested in identifying a vehicle for updating and strengthening their school's reading program can initiate this procedure to involve their faculties in actively exploring the issues involved in reading in their schools.

References

Artley, A. "The Teacher Variable in the Teaching of Reading." Reading Teacher, Vol. 22, 1969.

Bond, G. L., and Dykstra, R. "The Cooperative Research Program in First Grade Reading." Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. 2, 1967.

Harris, A. J., and Morrison, C. "The CRAFT Project: A Final Report." The Reading Teacher, Vol. 22, 1969.

Hoepfner, R., Bradley, P. A., Klein, S. P., and Alkin, M. C. Center for the Study of Evaluation Elementary School Evaluation Kit: Needs Assessment. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Turner, R. L. Research in Teacher Education. Teacher Education Forum, Vol. 3, 1973.

What We Have Sown, That Shall We Reap

M. Jean Greenlaw
University of Georgia

The basic premise of this article is that teacher education is essentially responsible for the situation that exists in reading education in the public schools today. It is the way we have taught teachers that has created the state of phonics preparedness, comprehension debilitation, and apathy toward reading that is now exhibited by many children enrolled in our public schools. We tend to teach as we have been taught, and our college classrooms are often reflected in the methods used in the earlier school years. Let us examine several aspects of the college classroom that can have deleterious effects on teachers and their students.

Our college classes in reading are often skills oriented courses aimed toward developing certain proficiencies in our students that can be measured accurately. This seems to be a worthy goal, but upon reflection produces teachers who are skills oriented and confuse skills with reading. What is wrong with skills? Nothing, as long as they are seen as a means to the end of reading, and not the end itself. In far too many college and elementary classes, skills have become synonymous with reading. Ask almost any primary child who has had three books read to him one day by a substitute in lieu of a phonics lesson if he has had "reading" that day and the child will answer "no". Most children believe that reading is grunting and groaning through isolated sounds and coloring words red if they have the sound of "oo" as in good and blue if they have the sound of "oo" as in coop. They believe this is reading because the teacher calls them to "reading group" and puts them through these often asinine tasks in the name of becoming good readers.

There certainly are phonics skills that are generally helpful to children in learning to decode words. Teachers should become aware of these skills and learn effective ways to teach them to children. <u>But</u>, they should not become the bulk of the reading program. We, as college teachers, should analyze our presentations and teach our students to become reasoned practitioners of the art of teaching, not mere followers of basal manuals and distributors and graders of ditto sheets and workbook pages.

Phonics is so much easier to teach than is comprehension. That is probably why more phonics than comprehension is taught at the elementary and college levels and why phonics programs proliferate in both basals and supplementary reading materials. Phonics is measurable. Editors

sitting in Boston, Chicago, New York or wherever have definitely decreed which words should be colored red and which ones blue and we perpetuate that nonsense.

Comprehension is different. It moves into those areas of variable answers that most teachers avoid like the plague. If we get past the safe topics of main idea and details and into the evaluative, judgmental, and appreciative realms we are into what makes one a reader. Reading is not just calling words or listing facts in sequence; it is understanding the printed word, being changed by it, and acting upon what we have read. We do precious little training of students at any level in these skills. It takes time, it takes effort, and it takes a feeling of security on the part of teachers and students to particpate in this type of learning.

Another problem is that reading is often separated from the other language arts in an artificial course structure at the college level, and this is repeated in the public schools. Reading teachers often act as if the other language arts are alien and of considerably lesser importance. Our college classes should strive to eradicate these barriers and help teachers see ways to make all of the language arts complementary. Repetitive tasks could be eliminated and more time spent on creative language building tasks.

Apathy was mentioned at the beginning of this article. For a reader, this is the most depressing aspect of our failure. The idea that we can not engender a liking and even a love of reading in others, is sad. But, consider your own courses. What do <u>you</u> do to make <u>your</u> students love reading? Are module tests that measure their proficiency in skills going to make them willingly sit up until 2 A.M. because they started a book that is so good they have to finish it before they go to sleep?

My suggestion to combat this apathy is to read a good book to your college classes every day. I can hear you answer me: you don't have time. There is so much you have to <u>teach</u> that you couldn't possibly read to your classes very often. That is exactly what teachers at all levels tell me. And I answer that there is no better way to teach reading than to expose students to good books and expand their language capabilities and interests. Carol Chomsky (1970) has shown us that reading and being read to has a desided effect on children's language production. If you must justify reading aloud on a skills basis, read her study.

I would hope, however, that one could justify reading aloud to students every day on a different basis. I would hope that the increased interest in class; students reminding you if you fail to bring a book to class or haven't read it yet as the period draws to a close; students staying after class to discuss a book or asking where they can <u>buy</u> a copy of a particular book you read; and the satisfaction of seeing your student's interests in and appreciation of books increased, would be justification enough.

To summarize, I am suggesting that the next time we come back from a consulting stint and shake our heads at the lack of imagination and preparedness of teachers shown in the classrooms we visited, we pull ourselves up to a screeching halt and examine our own classroom. Are we reaping that which we have sown?